



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

RECENT RABBINICAL LITERATURE

Die Mischna, Challa (Teighebe). Text, Übersetzung und Erklärung. Nebst einem textkritischen Anhang. Von Dr. KARL ALBRECHT, Professor in Oldenburg in Gr. Giessen : ALFRED TÖPELMANN, 1913. pp. iv + 48.

Die Mischna, Baba Qamma ('Erste Pforte' des Civilrechts). Text, Übersetzung und Erklärung. Nebst einem textkritischen Anhang. Von WALTER WINDFUHR, Pastor an St. Catharinen in Hamburg. Giessen : ALFRED TÖPELMANN, 1913. pp. viii + 96.

THESE two volumes are two further instalments of the Mishnah under the editorship of Georg Beer and Oscar Holtzmann. One is pleased to note a marked improvement upon the first two volumes by the editors (Berakot by Holtzmann and Pesahim by Beer). There is no attempt to do pioneer work, but an earnest endeavour to give a comprehensive commentary on the texts, ample use being made of the labours of predecessors, with due acknowledgement, whenever necessary. The real aim of this edition becomes quite apparent: it is to introduce Christian theologians to rabbinic literature, and as such it certainly has some merit.

Prof. Albrecht's introduction to Ḥallah is brief, but the author is careful not to omit anything of importance. It deals with the name and position of this tractate, its date and composition. He agrees with tradition in ascribing the redaction of this tractate, as well as the entire Mishnah, to R. Judah ha-Nasi, since no authority after that scholar is mentioned. There are, however, a few interpolations which belong to a later age. The history of giving Ḥallah is briefly sketched out. The Mosaic law and the custom of modern Jews to throw a piece of dough into the oven are described.

The text is, with a few exceptions, carefully vocalized and explained. Jewish commentators, like Maimonides and Bartinoro, are largely drawn upon. As Prof. Albrecht is the author of a useful grammar of mishnic Hebrew, he may be regarded as a reliable guide on many points, and his explanations of the constructions are very valuable. He certainly has grammar on his side when he translates the clause *הרי זה עובר בפסח*, *so muss dies am Pascha weggeschafft werden* (I, 2 a), against Maimonides and Bartinoro, who explain it to mean that he who keeps it (one of the five kinds) transgresses the law of Passover. Albrecht refers to Pesahim III, 1 in support of his interpretation. It must, however, be admitted that the mishnic idiom is in favour of the other explanation.

The punctuation of the Hebrew words in the text and notes, despite the care bestowed upon it, is not free from errors. *צָרַף* (p. 6, notes) does not mean *he added*; read *צָרַף* in Pî'el. For *אוֹבְלִין* (p. 14) read *אוֹבְלִין*, as there can be no doubt that the form is like biblical *אוֹבְלִים* (Gen. 25. 27) where *וַיְ* became a full vowel. *עָפַר חוּצָה לְאֶרֶץ* (2. 2a) is impossible; read *עָפַר*. For *מִסְתַּאֲבֹת* (2. 2b) read *מִסְתַּאֲבֹת*. Prof. Albrecht is unnecessarily troubled about the form *יֹבְלָה* (II, 3a). In the notes he remarks that it is *eine auffällige Form des Partizips für יֹבְלָה*. But since the finite verb *יָבַל* is a *fa'ula* form in the Bible, *יֹבְלָה* is quite correct, just as *יָגַר* is a participle, or verbal adjective, of *יָגַר* (Jer. 22. 25 ; 39. 17). Instead of *בָּבֵר* (p. 32, twice) read *בָּבֵר* as e.g. in Eccles. 1. 10.

On the whole Windfuhr's treatment resembles more that of Albrecht rather than that of the general editors, though he, too, speaks, in his preface, of pioneer work. His introduction is brief, and deals with the name of the tractate and its composition, the practical application of the laws treated of, and the authorities whose decisions and opinions are mentioned. He is certainly right when he remarks that in spite of the attempt of the Romans to deprive the Jews of all forms of independence, the latter found it possible to adjudicate cases among themselves. Hence the laws of the Mishnah have a practical value for the Jews. He also agrees with Jewish scholars that the civil laws of

the Mishnah are the result of an internal development, and have borrowed little or nothing from foreign codes. A comparison with Roman law gives no cause to assume that the Mishnah is indebted to it to a great extent. For similarities do not prove dependence.

The text is vocalized with grammatical accuracy, and deviations from traditional pronunciation are prominent, though not always necessary, and in some cases unjustifiable. The notes, as a rule, are very useful and instructive. Jewish scholars, even those who wrote in Hebrew, like Israel Lipschütz, author of *תפארת ישראל*, are frequently quoted. Grammatical slips, however, occur, now and again, and I should like to call attention to a few of them. *בְּתַרְסִיָּה* (III, 1, p. 18) ought to be *בְּתַרְסִיָּה*. For the impossible *שְׁלֹוֹה* (p. 21) read *שְׁלֹוֹה*, as in the text. Instead of *וְהַחֲוִירוֹ* (X, 8, p. 84) it is preferable to read *וְהַחֲוִירוֹ*. Another grammatical mistake is *עֲשֶׂה אִמָּה* (VI, 4 e, p. 48) instead of *עֲשֶׂה אִמּוֹת*. It is true that in most editions rules of gender are not strictly observed, but a critical edition ought to avoid such slips. The correct vocalization of the post-biblical word *עוֹבֵר* *a fetus* can only be determined by a knowledge of grammar. The traditional pronunciation is *עוֹבֵר*, and has a good analogy in biblical *יֹלֵד* (Judges 13. 8). Barth in his essay *Das passive Qal und seine Participien* explains such forms as the original passive participle of *Qal* instead of *קָטַל*. At all events no cogent reason can be brought against tradition in this respect. To disregard this and to vocalize it *עוֹבֵר* (V, 1, p. 36), is hardly justifiable, especially as the form *fā'al* is extremely rare in Semitic languages. Windfuhr should have at least drawn attention to it. A similar deviation from tradition is the vocalization *סוֹמֵא* (VIII, 1 f, p. 60), which is usually pronounced *סוֹמָא*. Now Syriac *ܫܡܥܐ* (Passive Participle of *Pe'al*) would presuppose a Hebrew form *סָמֵא* or *סָמִי* which actually occurs, though in a slightly different sense (Ketubot 105a). Here again it is possible that *סוֹמֵא* represents the old Passive Participle, and would therefore be fully justified. Moreover, as *סוֹמָא* denotes an inherent defect, it is akin to terms denoting colour (comp. *עֵינַי* *blind* and *תָּוִיר*, or *תָּוִיר* *white*), and

would therefore have an analogy in Aramaic אִיבָּם *black*. The vocalization טִימָא is accordingly no improvement. In explaining קִיִצֵר (p. 13) the author should have mentioned the fact that in old manuscripts which come from the Orient, the spelling is usually כְּאִיִצֵר = כְּאִיזָה צֵר, and sometimes כְּאִיִצֵר = כְּאִיזָה צֵר. The expression שלש על שלש (X, 10, p. 86) is translated by Dr. Windfuhr *drei zu drei* [*Handbreiten*]. In his notes he mentions that Martinoro explains it as *Fingerlängen*; but he refers to Baba ḥamma V, 5, where the hand-breadth is used as measure. But the latter passage has עֶשְׂרֵה with a masculine noun (טֶפַח), whereas here we have a feminine numeral. Now the usage of the Mishnah in this respect is consistent: whenever a masculine noun is understood, we have to supply טֶפַח *a hand-breadth*; but when a feminine noun is understood we have to supply אֶצְבֵּעַ *a finger's breadth*. Dr. Windfuhr is under the erroneous impression that אֶצְבֵּעַ and טֶפַח are about the same, for he takes the latter to mean *finger's length*. As a matter of fact a טֶפַח contains four אֶצְבָּעוֹת (see Rashi, Pesahim 109 b). This usage is evident in the following passage למִדְרֵם עַל שְׁלֹשָׁה שְׁלֹשָׁה מִטְמָא הַבֵּנָה מִטְמָא מִשּׁוּם שְׁלֹשָׁה עַל שְׁלֹשָׁה (Kelim 27, 2). This ought to be a warning to modern scholars not to venture too often to disagree with early Jewish writers upon matters of idiom and usage. The latter are perhaps not scientific, but they know their subject.

The critical appendixes are very useful, and are well compiled. They give the variants from all available sources.

Die Mischna Joma (Der Versöhnungstag). Text, Übersetzung und Erklärung. Nebst einem textkritischen Anhang. Von D. JOHANNES MEINHOLD, o. Prof. d. Theologie an der Univ. Bonn. Giessen: ALFRED TÖPELMANN, 1913. pp. iv + 83.

Die Mischna Middot (von den Massen des Tempels). Text, Übersetzung und Erklärung. Nebst einem textkritischen Anhang. Von D. OSCAR HOLTZMANN, a. o. Prof. d. Theologie an der Univ. Giessen. Giessen: ALFRED TÖPELMANN, 1913. pp. viii + 112.

As tractate Yoma deals with the observances of the Day of Atonement, Prof. Meinhold thought it advisable to devote the greater part of his introduction to the sources and history of that fast. The well-known problems that occupy the minds of higher critics of the Bible are fully discussed, and the results arrived at are those that are usually met with, namely, that the Day of Atonement is a post-exilic institution, since P is the only biblical writer who mentions it. Indeed, Prof. Meinhold thinks it possible that the idea of having a Day of Atonement in order to purify the Temple and the congregation arose after Ezekiel by whose vision it was suggested. The ceremonies of that day are described by Professor Meinhold, though not always satisfactorily explained, as in many instances no plausible reason can be found, owing to our imperfect knowledge of ancient institutions. The writer shows a thorough grasp of the difficult problems, and gives the most advanced views. It is, however, questionable whether such a discussion is relevant to this subject. The remainder of the introduction is devoted to the contents of this tractate, and a brief summary is given of the high priest's procedure.

The editor should have had no difficulty in dealing with the text and in preparing his translation and notes, as he made use of the labours of Baneth, Strack, and other writers to whom he acknowledges his indebtedness. Yet it is impossible to accord unqualified praise to this part of Prof. Meinhold's work. From the philological standpoint his notes are insufficient. Such words as פָּרוּה (III, 3) and מַצְלִיף (V, 3) were not considered worthy of annotation. Nor is the translation free from errors which betray an inadequate knowledge of Hebrew grammar. A glaring instance is בָּא לוֹ אֶצֶל פָּרוּ שֵׁנִיה (IV, 2) which Prof. Meinhold renders: *Nun trat er zu seinem zweiten Farren*, making שֵׁנִיה agree with פָּר! This erroneous translation incidentally shows that the editor did not follow the high priest's procedure in this respect. We are told in III, 8 that the high priest came up to his bullock, and after uttering his confession, walked up to the north of the altar to cast lots on the two goats. It is therefore necessary for the Mishnah to state that the high priest came up to his bullock

a second time. A curious misprint is פתחו ההיכל (III, 10). I do not suppose that the editor would wish to justify such constructions by בָּנוּ בְּעֶר (Num. 24. 3) and חִיתִּי שָׂרִי (Isa. 56. 9). In the *textkritischer Anhang* the phrase is quoted correctly פתחו של היכל. A difficult passage to which the editor, like all his predecessors, fails to draw attention is וְנוֹלֵל אֶת־הַתּוֹרָה וּמִנִּיחָהּ בַּחֲיוֹן (VII, 1). The word בַּחֲיוֹן cannot mean *in his bosom*, as the high priest was standing, apart from the fact that this would be a disrespectful procedure. The obvious suggestion is to read בַּחֲיוֹן *in his case* (Greek *θήκη*). But this supposition seems unlikely on account of the agreement of all texts. In *ZAW.*, 1910, p. 121, I suggested to render Prov. 16. 33: *The lot is cast in the urn, but its judgment is from Jahweh*, taking חֵיק to be identical in meaning with Arabic *ḥiq'* a box, and deriving it from *ḥiqq*. The translation *box* or *case* in this Mishnah would admirably suit the context. The suffix of בַּחֲיוֹן may refer to סֹפֵר which some editions and manuscripts have, or to the high priest. The former alternative is more likely.

The main part of Holtzmann's introduction is taken up with the description of the Second Temple as given by the tractate Middot and by Josephus, and is a valuable contribution to this subject. While recognizing the fact that this tractate contains many important and trustworthy data about Herod's Temple, the editor is inclined to side with Josephus when the two accounts are at variance. He rightly observes that Josephus must have been familiar with the structure of the Temple where he probably officiated as priest. Great caution is to be taken in using Josephus in connexion with facts concerning the Romans. In such cases he was prone to sacrifice truth to personal motives. But he had nothing to gain by giving misleading data concerning the Temple. Moreover he wrote also for people who, like himself, knew all details of the structure of the Temple, and it is impossible to think that he would have dared to falsify the facts. The tractate Middot, on the other hand, was redacted about 150 C.E., that is to say, eighty years after the destruction of the Temple, when few, if any, eye-witnesses still survived. There is not sufficient

ground, as Prof. Holtzmann points out, for assuming that R. Eliezer b. Jacob saw the Temple. It is true that his mother's brother officiated as a Levite (comp. Middot I, 2); but this does not preclude his having been a contemporary of Abba Saul, and of having been born after the destruction of the Temple. The trustworthiness of Josephus in connexion with his account of the Temple was attacked by Hildesheimer and Schürer, but Holtzmann refutes practically all their arguments. After his explanations most of the discrepancies in Josephus disappear.

The text of this tractate has often been explained, and on the whole there are hardly any difficult constructions here. But, as in his former publications, Prof. Holtzmann misunderstood a few very easy passages. A curious combination of blunders has been committed by him in I, 2 which reads as follows: וכל משמר שאינו עומד ואומר לו איש הר הבית שלום עליך נכר שהוא ישן חובטו במקלו. It is quite obvious to any one who is familiar with Hebrew, and particularly mishnic constructions, that משמר is the subject of וואמר and that עליך . . . איש is a direct quotation. But Holtzmann takes איש to be the subject of וואמר, and gives this logical rendering: *und zu jedem Posten, welcher nicht stand, da sprach der Mann des Tempelbergs: 'Friede sei mit dir!' Bemerkte er, dass er schlief, so schlug er ihn mit seinem Stock.* The frequently occurring word נָכַר is vocalized by Holtzmann נִכֵּר. The Kāl of this verb does not exist in Hebrew, and for the active the Hiphil is used. An editor of a Hebrew text may at least be expected to use a lexicon intelligently, and I am afraid that such mistakes are to some extent due to Prof. Holtzmann's indifference. A number of other inaccurate vocalizations occur in this text. שְׁאַרְעוּ (II, 2) is impossible. *A priori* one would expect the verb אָרַע to be used in Kāl like Arabic عَرَضَ. But there are cases where the spelling אִירַע which presupposes a Pi^{el}. If we consider it a Kāl, we ought to vocalize the word שְׁאַרְעוּ, and if a Pi^{el}, it should be שְׁאַרְעוּ. בִּשְׁעַת (II, 4) should be בִּשְׁעָת. There is also nothing to gain by substituting עֲוֵרַת (*Temple-court*) for traditional עֲוֵרַת (II, 7, &c.), as *e* is usually favoured by *y*.

Verzeichnis der Personennamen in der Mishna. Von D. EMIL SCHÜRER, weil. ordentl. Professor der Theologie in Göttingen. Leipzig: J. C. HINRICHS, 1913. pp. iv + 23.

Before his death Schürer expressed his wish that this pamphlet should be published. As the editor, Hugo Duensing, points out, there is sufficient justification in this publication. It is true that an index of the important proper names occurring in the Mishnah has been published in Hebrew by Mr. Braunschweiger in his book *The Teachers of the Mishnah*. But that index is neither complete nor reliable. Schürer, on the other hand, was a careful and painstaking worker. He devoted his life to the mishnic period, and his *Geschichte des Jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi* is a striking example of erudition and system. For the compilation of this index he made use of all manuscripts at his disposal, and it is therefore put on a critical basis. He took great care to point out where there is reason to doubt the authenticity of a passage.

It is to be hoped that this index will prove to be a stepping-stone for the compilation of a complete concordance of the Mishnah which is so much needed.

Beiträge zur Geschichte und Literatur im geonäischen Zeitalter. Von Dr. S. EPPENSTEIN. Berlin: LOUIS LAMM, 1913. pp. 218.

It is one of fate's little ironies that the gaonic period which practically shaped present-day Judaism is so little known. The Masorah, liturgy, and the fixing of Halakah in general may be regarded as the products of those centuries. But there is such a dearth of historical records that the Geonim and the heads of other academies are, with the exception of a few cases, no more than mere names, while there can be no doubt that a number of scholars who influenced Jewish life are not even known by name. We owe a great deal to the constructive genius of Graetz, who, with but scanty material at his disposal, drew a comprehensive sketch of this important period. The discovery of the Genizah

marks a new epoch in this field of research. Views that had formerly been regarded as certain were found to be untenable, and it is safe to assert that the more the Genizah is explored, the more light will be thrown on that obscure period. The fragments hitherto made accessible have been studied with great assiduity, and profitable results have been obtained. A band of scholars in Europe and America are busily engaged in elucidating every passage appertaining to this period, and in lifting the veil as much as possible. And one of the ablest workers is Dr. Eppenstein who has published a number of essays on this subject in the *Monatsschrift*. Five of these essays are reprinted in this volume.

Dr. Eppenstein bases his studies upon the new material, and in the five essays discusses the most important phases of the gaonic period. The first essay deals briefly with Bostanai and his descendants. It is pointed out by the author that opinions about Bostanai's marriage with the Persian woman are divided. Some of the early halakists looked favourably upon it, and a number of Geonim traced their origin to that exilarch. On the other hand a fragment published by G. Margoliouth in *JQR.*, XIV, speaks disparagingly of this marriage. This is in accord with Sherira, who, in his Epistle, emphatically dissociates his family from that of Bostanai. The second essay is devoted to the relation of the Gaon to the exilarch and to the constitution of the academies. These two subjects are teeming with intricate problems, and although Dr. Eppenstein is unable to arrive at new conclusions, he has treated them in all details, and drawn an able sketch of the conditions of the academies. The centre of Jewish learning having in that period been shifted to Babylon, Palestine was almost entirely neglected by the majority of historians. It was usually assumed that the latter country was practically devoid of scholars. This view has proved quite untenable, and Dr. Eppenstein in his third essay describes the spiritual activity in Palestine till the beginning of the tenth century. Sacred poetry, the Masorah, and a number of Midrashim were products of Palestinian activity during these centuries. Dr. Eppenstein rightly observes that although Halakah was not much

cultivated in the Holy Land, that country was the home of the Midrash with its poetic imagery (p. 24). About the paitān R. Phineas, I should like to remark that in a Genizah fragment at the Dropsie College there is a hymn by Phineas ha-Kohen. There are also a few hymns by Phineas Rosh Yeshibah in the Bodleian Library (see Neubauer and Cowley, *Catalogue*, vol. II).

As Saadya may be considered the most prominent Gaon whose many-sided activities and numerous writings place him above all others who filled the office of Gaonate, a considerably long essay is devoted to him. All phases of his activity are touched upon by Dr. Eppenstein. Apart from the complete works by that Gaon, like his philosophic treatise *al-Amānāt wal-ʾItikādāt* and his Arabic translation of the Pentateuch that have never been lost sight of, there were recently discovered a considerable amount of fragments which shed a flood of light upon his life and works. The most notable are Harkavy's *Studien und Mitteilungen*, vol. V, and Schechter's *Saadyana*. Owing to the multiplicity of subjects that Dr. Eppenstein discusses, he overlooked a few points to which it may not be out of place to draw attention. While treating of Saadya's *Reshut* to his *Azharot* (p. 122) the author states that it contained twenty-four sections and that eight of them have been preserved in Samuel b. Ḥofni's commentary (*Saadyana*, p. 43). As a matter of fact twenty sections have been preserved in a fragment by an unknown writer which was published in *JQR.*, VI, p. 705. I have proved elsewhere (*JQR.*, New Series, IV, 539 ff.) that it is not by Ḥefes b. Yasliaḥ as surmised by Neubauer, and that there is no evidence to connect it with Samuel b. Ḥofni as was suggested by Marx in Ginzberg's *Geonica*, vol. I, p. 179. That fragment gives the number of sections as twenty-five. This seems to be a more reliable reading, since an illegible ה may be read as ד, while the opposite case is less likely.—Since Harkavy published Saadya's *Sefer ha-Galui* it was customary to assume that it consisted of ten chapters, and Dr. Eppenstein repeats this statement (p. 129 f.). That this is an impossible view may be seen from Saadya's calling the chapters אנרין instead of אנואב. Furthermore, he says that

the first seven chapters are special, while the remaining three are general and extend over the entire book. How this can be achieved passes my comprehension. It is, however, quite obvious that the book contained seven chapters, which are actually enumerated. But the author had ten objects, or aims, for writing that book. Seven objects were explained in the seven chapters, and the remaining three had no separate chapters, but were made evident throughout the book. See Bacher, *JQR.*, XII, 703.—I do not know on what authority Dr. Eppenstein asserts that the people of Kairuwān translated שְׁעִירֵי the Christian's book into Hebrew (p. 132). Even Harkavy's defective text does not admit of such an interpretation. What Saadya says is that the people of Kairuwān composed a book relating that which befel them at the hands of that Christian. Now that we have a more correct copy of that text (see H. Malter, *JQR.*, New Series, III, 487 ff.), we know that שְׁעִירֵי was a misreading for שְׁנוּרֵי. The last word no doubt represents Hebrew שְׁנוּרֵי, as Saadya translates שְׁנוּרֵי by שְׁנוּרֵי (see the suggestion recorded in my name, *l.c.*, p. 489, note 5), and probably designates a certain town, just as אֲשֹׁר is restricted to Mosul.

The fifth essay deals with the narrative of the four captives that is given by Abraham b. Daud in his סֵדֶר הַקְּבִלָּה. The authenticity of this narrative has long ago been questioned, and an able monograph was written on it by Israel Lewy of Breslau. Dr. Eppenstein relegates this story to the domain of legend. He presents an attractive and interesting sketch of the state of Jewish culture in Egypt, Spain, and Italy at that time, and is thereby led to the conclusion that the four supposed captives were scarcely needed to disseminate Jewish learning in those countries. Moreover, he points out the impossibility that any of the captives hailed from Babylon. According to his theory, Shemariah cannot be regarded as a captive, and he very likely belonged to a family that had for generations made Egypt its home. Hushiel came on his own accord to Kairuwān, and was probably a native of Southern Italy. Moses b. Hānok might easily have been a native of Spain. As for the fourth captive there is no need to speculate

about his origin, since even his name was not preserved. This theory dispels the beautiful illusion that at the decline of the Gaonate, Providence caused four Babylonian scholars to be taken captive, so that they might spread the knowledge of the Talmud in the diaspora. Dr. Eppenstein may be right, but he has failed to account for the origin of the legend for which Abraham b. Daud cannot be made responsible, since he does not know the name of the fourth captive.

Die Abfassungszeit der Baraita der 32 Normen für die Auslegung der heiligen Schrift. Eine Untersuchung. Von DR. LEO BARDOWICZ, Rabbiner der israel. Kultusgemeinde in Mödling. Berlin: M. POPPELAUER, 1913. pp. vi + 110.

Of the numerous problems that tax the mind of the investigator of rabbinic literature the one relating to the authorship of certain books is not the least perplexing. Tradition in the majority of cases cannot be relied upon, as it is usually the result of doctrinal speculations. A glaring illustration of this point is the Baraita of the thirty-two principles for the interpretation of Scripture which was ascribed by tradition to R. Eli'ezer b. R. Josë ha-Gelili. As no external argument could be brought against this tradition, modern scholars saw no reason for doubting its validity. It was only by a thorough-going investigation of this Baraita that H. Katzenellenbogen as early as 1822 pointed out, in his commentary on this text, that the illustrations following the principles were later additions. This was easily proved by the fact that some of the illustrations are taken from amoraic interpretations. But even Katzenellenbogen and all other scholars after him took it for granted that R. Eli'ezer was the author of this Baraita in its original form which contained a mere enumeration of the thirty-two principles. By a minute and careful study, however, Dr. Bardowicz was enabled to prove this opinion untenable. He analyses every principle with great erudition and critical acumen, and points out that twenty-eight of these principles were known to Tannaim who preceded R. Eli'ezer, while the remaining four are

of much later date. Many a reader will be surprised to find that two of these principles were quite unknown even in the amoraic period. These principles are nine (דרך קצרה *elliptical expression*, that is to say, some words are missing in the Bible, and are to be supplied in the interpretation) and eleven (סדור שנחלק *a different marking of verses*). The illustrations given in the Baraita for these two principles are very interesting even for modern biblical exegesis. But Dr. Bardowicz rightly observes that these verses are interpreted quite differently in rabbinic literature. Furthermore no talmudic or midrashic example can be cited where a biblical verse is interpreted in accordance with either of these principles. The attempts made by Katzenellenbogen and Einhorn to reduce some interpretations to these two principles are ably refuted by Dr. Bardowicz.

The circumstance that this Baraita is nowhere quoted in amoraic literature militates against its tannaitic authorship. To this may be added the significant fact that R. Sherira, who in his Epistle describes the methods of interpretation employed by the Tannaim and Amoraim, does not mention this Baraita. This *argumentum ex silentio* has peculiar force in this connexion, and Dr. Bardowicz employs it very skilfully. For Sherira does mention a number of these principles, and had he known them as one collection, he would have referred to the Baraita itself, as he does in the case of the thirteen principles of R. Ismael.

In consequence of these weighty considerations the conclusion forces itself upon us that R. Eli'ezer could have been neither the author nor the redactor of this Baraita in any shape or form. These negative results of Dr. Bardowicz's investigation appear to be well grounded, and are an important gain for our knowledge of rabbinic literature.

But Dr. Bardowicz is not content with mere negative results, and the second part of his monograph is devoted to the attempt to ascertain who the real author of this Baraita is. This is naturally a very arduous task; but Dr. Bardowicz's insight and originality stand him in good stead. The conclusion he arrives at is startling and fascinating at the same time. He first proceeds

to prove that the collection and final redaction of these principles took place during the gaonic period. For it is during the later years of that period that the ninth and eleventh principles were first employed. Direct and positive evidence for this view is furnished by an obscure passage occurring in the famous commentary by a pupil of Sa'adyā on the Books of Chronicles. In one of his notes this commentator remarks *ובענין דברים הללו מעיני רב סעדיה נאון מספרי במדות חכמים ובספר היוכלות שהביא אלפיומי רב סעדיה נאון מספרי הישיבה* (ed. Kirchheim, p. 36). No satisfactory identification has hitherto been suggested of these two books. After minutely examining the opinions expressed by Kirchheim, who edited this commentary, and by L. Donath who described the Rostock MS. in Berliner's *Magazin* I, Dr. Bardowicz is led to the almost inevitable conclusion that by *מדות חכמים* the commentator meant the Baraita of the thirty-two principles. For it is by a careful study of the contents of this Baraita that the commentator is enabled to solve many difficulties in biblical exegesis. Incidentally Dr. Bardowicz throws a good deal of light upon obscure passages occurring in this commentator's introduction where this Baraita is more explicitly referred to. We accordingly have the authority of a writer of the tenth century that the thirty-two principles are the product of the gaonic academies, and this satisfactorily accounts for the circumstance that R. Sherira does not mention it in describing the hermeneutic principles employed by the Tannaim and Amoraim.

The same commentator informs us that Sa'adyā not only copied the books of the academies, but also introduced important innovations *הנאון רב סעדיה תקיף שניתן אסור בבית שומר, שלש עשרה) שנה נאסר בבית המלכים, והעתיק מספרי הישיבה, וחידש דברים שלא (שמעה און*. Dr. Bardowicz accordingly suggests that the innovations consisted in the ninth and eleventh principles. Apparent support for this assumption may be found in the appendix of this monograph where it is shown that Sa'adyā employed each of these principles about fifty times. Now this list, which is by no means exhaustive, strikingly contrasts with the established fact that, as far as it is known to us, no exegete before Sa'adyā

made use of these principles. Dr. Bardowicz is also of opinion that Sa'adyā, besides being the originator of these two principles, supplied many illustrations for the remaining thirty.

In spite of the clever combinations of which Dr. Bardowicz made use, few scholars will be willing to follow him as far as that. Sa'adyā is one of the few fortunate Jewish writers whose lives and literary activities are fairly well known, and it is indeed very strange that no allusion to this work is made by himself or any other writer. In his lengthy prefaces to his Arabic translation of the Bible he had occasion to refer to his discovery of two very important principles of biblical exegesis. Sa'adyā was by no means a man who hid his light under a bushel, and was therefore not prevented by modesty from referring to his own works. Moreover Sa'adyā's pupil would certainly not have omitted to state that the *מדות חכמים* was the work of his master. It seems more plausible to assume that this Baraita is a gaonic composition of which Sa'adyā made extensive use. It is inaccurate to consider Sa'adyā the first biblical exegete, as is done by Dr. Bardowicz. Ibn Janāḥ in his *Kitāb al-Luma'* (ed. Derenbourg, p. 15) says that he made use of the works of rational commentators like Sa'adyā, Sherira, Hai, Samuel b. Ḥofni, Ḥefeṣ Rosh Kalla, and other commentators and Geonim. Now the Geonim referred to must be those who lived before Sa'adyā, since his successors who applied themselves to the study of the Bible are explicitly named.

At the end of his monograph Dr. Bardowicz advances the hypothesis that the *ספר היובלות* mentioned in the commentary on Chronicles is not the Book of Jubilees, but a chronological book which was a sort of supplementary part to the *מדות חכמים*. The entire work thus consisted of two parts, one dealing with methodology and the other with chronology, and was a kind of introduction to the Talmud. This, however, requires further confirmation.

B. HALPER.

Dropsie College.